



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/089,467

03/27/2002

Howard D. Dean

28728-65

9628

21130

7590

08/31/2009

BENESCH, FRIEDLANDER, COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP

ATTN: IP DEPARTMENT DOCKET CLERK

200 PUBLIC SQUARE

SUITE 2300

CLEVELAND, OH 44114-2378

EXAMINER

LAURITZEN, AMANDA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3737

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/31/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent@beneschlaw.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/089,467	Applicant(s) DEAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Amanda L. Lauritzen	Art Unit 3737	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Amanda L. Lauritzen. (3) ____.

(2) Luis Carrion (Reg. No. 61,255). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 20 August 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 8, 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ateshian et al. (US 6,126,690).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Amanda L. Lauritzen/ Examiner, Art Unit 3737	/BRIAN CASLER/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3737
--------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant explained that the invention is directed to an implant (specifically a cranial implant, at least in one embodiment) and contrasted this with the reference which is primarily directed to joint prosthetic implants. It was noted that at least claim 1 merely prescribes "medical device" and that the steps do not exclude applications involving both prosthetic and other types of implants. It is additionally noted that "implant," if claimed absent any further defining limitations, is so broad as to encompass prosthetic implants. Applicant went on to explain that the image produced includes a portion of defective hard tissue and a portion of nondefective hard tissue, and further identified defective tissue as that which is missing, as in the example of a skull having missing hard tissue and requiring a cranial implant as in applicant's Fig. 1A. Examiner noted that each of the embodiments described in Ateshian et al. fall into one of two categories, those that image the joint that is the surgical site and those that image the healthy opposite joint. It was pointed out that in cases involving imaging of the surgical site, both defective and nondefective hard tissue will be present. Applicant explained that the template is applied to "span" the defective portion of tissue as claimed and took the position that this will not happen in a surgical method involving a prosthetic joint. Examiner disagreed and explained that in cases of partial erosion of joint tissue, it is essential that the implant span the entire area or volume of defective (or missing) tissue and attach at nondefective tissue.

Potential claim limitations were discussed, including further specifying that the method is specific to applications for cranial implant(s) that are essentially flat to extend over a defective surface with a portion of hard tissue missing (in contrast to a three-dimensional prosthetic joint).

To elaborate on the rejection of 06 March 2009, it was explained that the template is corresponded to the "database of mathematical descriptions of a plurality of articular joint surface archetypes" (appearing at least at cols. 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8; and also cited in the Response to Arguments section of the identified Office action). The step of "warping" a template as claimed is corresponded to the step of "modifying the imaged data of the joint surface of the patient's bone to provide a more functional surface topography" (appearing at least at col. 7, lines 39-52), as warping is encompassed by modifying the surface topography. As to modifying the normative shape as a function of a shape of the non-defective portion, this feature is provided in optional embodiments that make use of an image of the opposite healthy joint and produce a mirror-image implant, but it additionally is understood that with modification of the surface topography, it is desirous to model it on non-defective tissue, such that after the device is surgically implanted the modified joint will closely match normal functioning anatomy and kinematics. Segmentation of the image is accomplished in delineating various joint surfaces so as to measure them in the image, as in col. 8, lines 8-37 and recited in the Response to Arguments section of the identified Office action.

(Applicant's proposed interview agenda is included herewith).